

Appl. No. : 09/975,466
Filed : October 9, 2001

REMARKS

Claims 1-17, 28 and 30-32 are pending in the present application. Claims 6 and 7 are allowed. The present amendments are made to clarify that copper oxide is reduced to copper metal in such a way that copper from the copper oxide is left on the substrate while oxygen from the copper oxide is removed. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, at page 8, lines 22-25 and page 9, lines 4-6.

The rejection of Claims 1-5, 8-17, 28 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Sundararajan (US 2002/0027286) in view of Donnelly Jr. et al. (US 6,143,658) has been maintained. As discussed in their previous response, Donnelly Jr. et al. teaches the etching of copper oxide with H(hfac). Thus, Donnelly Jr. et al. does not teach or suggest reduction of copper oxide on a substrate to leave copper from the copper oxide on the substrate while removing oxygen from the copper oxide as recited by independent Claims 1 and 28, as amended herein. Dependent Claims 2-5, 8-17 and 30-32 contain all of the features of the independent claims as well as additional distinguishing features. As a result, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-5, 8-17, 28 and 30-32.

Conclusion

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request the same. If any issues remain, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone Applicants' representative at the number provided below in order to resolve such issues promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: October 6, 2004

By: Andrew N. Merickel

Andrew N. Merickel
Registration No. 53,317
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(415) 954-4114